

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/776,080	02/01/2001	Wei-Lien Hsu	5500-60900	9437
7590 12/23/2004			EXAMINER	
B. Noel kivlin			DO, CHAT C	
Conley, Rose & Tayon, P.C. P.O. Box 398			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Austin, TX 7	8767-0398		2124	
			DATE MAILED: 12/23/2004	<b>\$</b>

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
<del>;</del>		1		Applicant(s)			
04	liaa Aatiaa Cumman	09/776,080	HSU ET AL.				
On	ice Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
: 		Chat C. Do	2124				
The N Period for Repl	MAILING DATE of this communication y	n appears on the cover sheet	with the correspondence add	iress			
THE MAILIN  - Extensions of ti after SIX (6) Mi  - If the period for  - If NO period for  - Failure to reply Any reply recei	IED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RIGORATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION me may be available under the provisions of 37 CF DNTHS from the mailing date of this communication reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, reply is specified above, the maximum statutory pwithin the set or extended period for reply will, by sived by the Office later than three months after the term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ON. FR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may n. a reply within the statutory minimum of eriod will apply and will expire SIX (6) Notatute, cause the application to become	a reply be timely filed thirty (30) days will be considered timely IONTHS from the mailing date of this co				
Status							
1)⊠ Respo	nsive to communication(s) filed on	07 September 2004.					
2a)⊠ This a	ction is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)	This action is non-final.					
	this application is in condition for all in accordance with the practice und		·	merits is			
Disposition of C	Claims						
4a) Of ( 5) ☐ Claim( 6) ☑ Claim( 7) ☑ Claim(	s) <u>1-3,6-12 and 14-19</u> is/are pending the above claim(s) is/are with s) is/are allowed. s) <u>1,11,12,14-19,21 and 22</u> is/are rest; <u>2,3 and 6-10</u> is/are objected to. s) are subject to restriction a	ejected.					
Application Pap	ers						
9)∐ The spe	ecification is objected to by the Exam	miner.					
10)☐ The dra	0)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applica	nt may not request that any objection to	the drawing(s) be held in abey	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
	ement drawing sheet(s) including the co th or declaration is objected to by th	· ·	-, ,	` '			
Priority under 3	5 U.S.C. & 119						
12)	vledgment is made of a claim for for b) Some * c) None of:  Certified copies of the priority docum Certified copies of the priority docum Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Buattached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received. nents have been received in priority documents have be ureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No en received in this National S	Stage			
Attachment(s)							
	rences Cited (PTO-892)		w Summary (PTO-413)				
3) 🔲 Information Di	sperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 sclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/St ail Date	<i>'</i>	lo(s)/Mail Date of Informal Patent Application (PTO 	-152)			

Art Unit: 2124

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

- 1. This communication is responsive to Amendment filed 09/07/04.
- 2. Claims 1-3, 6-12, 14-19, and 21-22 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 11, and 16-19 are independent claims. In Amendment, claims 1, 6, 11, and 16-19 are amended, claims 4-5, 13, and 20 are cancelled; and claims 21-22 are added. This action is made final.

### Claim Objections

3. Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities:

Re claim 6, the applicant is advised to amend claim 6 to depend on the existing claim. For examination purposes, the examiner considers claim 6 is dependent on claim 1.

Appropriate correction is required.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 5. Claims 1, 11, 14-19, and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Horton (U.S. 6,421,696).

Art Unit: 2124

The applied reference has a common assignee, Advanced Micro Devices, Inc., with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Re claim 1, Horton discloses in Figures 3 and 8 a method of performing a twodimensional discrete cosine transform (DCT) using a microprocessor having an instruction set that includes single-instruction multiple-data SIMD floating point instructions (abstract and col. 3 lines 24-30), wherein the method comprises: receiving a two-dimensional block of integer data having C columns and R rows (col. 1 lines 57-58 and col. 1 lines 36-42 wherein the frame of a video or image is a two dimensional data with rows and columns), wherein each of the R rows contains a set of C row data values, wherein the block of integer data is indicative of a portion of an image (col. 1 lines 36-42), wherein each of C and R is an even integer, and for each row, loading the entire set of C row data values of the row into a set of C/2 registers of the microprocessor (Figure 6 and col. 2 lines 44-50); converting the C row data values into floating point form (col. 4 lines 60-65), wherein each of the registers holds two of the floating point row data values (Figure 6); and performing a plurality of weighted-rotation operations on the values in the registers (Figure 10), wherein the weighted-rotation operations are performed using SIMD floating point instructions (col. 5 lines 1-6 and lines 28-34); altering the arrangement of values in the registers (e.g. arrangement needs to be made to reduce

Art Unit: 2124

complexity and avoid bottle neck and col. 2 lines 35-50); performing a second plurality of weighted-rotation operations on the values in the registers; again altering the arrangement of the values in the registers; performing a third plurality of weighted-rotation operations on the values in the registers; yet again altering the arrangement of the values in the registers (col. 5 lines 20-25); performing a fourth plurality of weighted-rotation operations on the values in the registers to obtain c intermediate floating point values: and storing the C intermediate floating point values into a next available row of an intermediate buffer (depending on the number of input data, more stages are repeated as seen in Figure 10 and Figure 1).

Re claim 11, it has the same limitations cited in claim 1 wherein the input data is the column instead of the row (e.g. since the reference does not define the input data is row or column, therefore, the row or column can be interchanged). Thus, claim 11 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 1.

Re claims 14-15, they have same limitation cited in claim 1. Thus, claims 14-15 are also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 1.

Re claim 16, it is a computer system claim of claim 1. Thus, claim 16 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 1.

Re claim 17, it is a carrier medium comprising software instruction claim of claim

1. Thus, claim 17 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 1.

Re claim 18, it is a computer system claim of claim 11. Thus, claim 18 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 11.

Art Unit: 2124

Re claim 19, it is a carrier medium comprising software instruction claim of claim 11. Thus, claim 19 is also rejected under the same rationale as cited in the rejection of rejected claim 11.

Re claim 21, Horton further discloses in Figures 3 and 8 C=8 and R=8 (e.g. col. 1 lines 35-40 with video/image size and its 1-D is 8 as seen in Figure 8).

Re claim 22, Horton further discloses in Figures 3 and 8 each of the weighted rotations of plurality, second plurality, third plurality and fourth plurality have a computational form given by the expressions: Y0 = A\*X0 + B\*X1, Y1 = -B\*XO + A\*X1, wherein A and B are coefficients, X0 and X1 are inputs to the weighted rotation, Y0 and Y1 are results of the weighted rotation (col. 4 lines 25-26).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Horton (U.S. 6,421,696).

Re claim 12, Horton does not discloses in Figures 3 and 8 the operation is done using a pfmul, a pfsub, and a pfadd instruction. However, the examiner takes an official notice that these instructions pfmul, pfsub, pfadd are known in the prior art. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2124

invention is made to add the pfmul, pfsub, and pfadd instructions into Horton's invention for performing the DCT operations because it would enable to simplify the system software and increase the performance.

## Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 2-3 and 6-10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

## Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 11-12, 14-19, and 21-22 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conventionally, the 2-D DCT can be performed by using 1-D DCT engine, transposed, and another same 1-D DCT engine wherein when transposed the results of 1-D DCT, the row data would be the column data and vice versa.

#### Conclusion

- 10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
  - a. U.S. Patent No. 4,821,224 to Liu et al. disclose a method and apparatus for processing multi-dimensional data to obtain a Fourier transform.

b. U.S. Patent No. 4,601,006 to Liu discloses an architecture for two dimensional fast Fourier transform.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chat C. Do whose telephone number is (571) 272-3721. The examiner can normally be reached on  $M \Rightarrow F$  from 7:00 AM to 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chaki Kakali can be reached on (571) 272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2124

Page 8

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Chat C. Do Examiner Art Unit 2124

December 7, 2004

TOPPINGBERG
PRIMANT EXAMINER